

## REMARKS

### Amendments to the Claims:

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1 and 4 have each been amended to add various limitations. Support for the amendments to each of claims 1 and 4 can be found at least in Figs. 4 and/or 5. Claim 2 has been amended to add all the limitations of claim 22, which depended from claim 2. Accordingly, claim 22 has been canceled as being redundant in view of the amendments to claim 2. Claim 8 has been amended to include all the limitations of claim 23, which depended from claim 8. Accordingly, claim 23 has been canceled as being redundant in view of the amendments to claim 8.

### Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 3 and 9 have each been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant notes that in previous amendments, claim 3 was canceled and then added in its original form as claim 22. Likewise, claim 9 was previously canceled and then added in its original form as claim 23. The applicant notes further that claim 22 (formerly claim 3) depended from claim 2 and that claim 23 (formerly claim 9) depended from claim 8. Thus, the applicant assumes that the examiner intended to indicate claim 22 rather than claim 3, and to indicate claim 23 rather than claim 9.

Rather than amend claims 22 and 23, the applicant has chosen to amend the base claims (2 and 8). That is, the applicant has hereby amended claim 2 to include all of the limitations of claim 22 (formerly claim 3), and has hereby amended claim 8 to include all of the limitations of claim 23 (formerly claim 9). Thus, claim 2 is an independent claim that now includes all the limitations of original claim 3, and claim 8 is an independent claim that now includes all the limitations of original claim 9. That is, the amendments to claim 2 have overcome the objection to claim 3 and the amendments to claim 8 have overcome the objection to claim 9. Accordingly, the applicant contends that claims 2 and 8 are now allowable.

Claims 10-21 have also been allowed. The examiner has indicated that at least claims 10-21 are allowable over the prior art of record because none of the



1 prior art of record teaches or fairly suggests storing a cartridge stamp in the cartridge  
2 memory, updating the set of label data stored in the cartridge memory, and then  
3 updating the cartridge stamp in response to updating the set of label data.

4 The applicant agrees with the examiner's conclusions regarding patentability,  
5 without necessarily agreeing with, or acquiescing in, the examiner's reasoning. In  
6 particular, the applicant believes that the claims are allowable because the prior art  
7 fails to teach, anticipate, or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of  
8 how the invention is paraphrased.

8 Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

9 Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being  
10 anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,867,335 to Ozue et al.

11 Claim 1 has been amended to now include all the limitations that the examiner  
12 has indicated are not taught or disclosed by the prior art of record. That is, claim 1  
13 has been amended to now include substantially the limitations of storing a cartridge  
14 stamp in the cartridge memory, updating the set of label data stored in the cartridge  
15 memory, and then updating the cartridge stamp in response to updating the set of  
16 label data. Accordingly, claim 1 is now allowable.

17 Claim 2 has been amended to be essentially identical to the original claim 3,  
18 which the examiner has indicated as being allowable. A more detailed explanation  
19 of the amendments to claim 2 is provided above. Accordingly, claim 2 is now  
20 allowable.

21 Claim 4 has been amended to now include all the limitations that the examiner  
22 has indicated are not taught or disclosed by the prior art of record. That is, claim 4  
23 has been amended to now include substantially the limitations of storing a cartridge  
24 stamp in the cartridge memory, updating the set of label data stored in the cartridge  
25 memory, and then updating the cartridge stamp in response to updating the set of  
label data. Accordingly, claim 4 is now allowable.

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 2. Each of claims 5-7 are therefore allowable  
for at least the reasons that claim 2 is allowable, as set forth above.

Claim 8 has been amended to be essentially identical to the original claim 9,  
which the examiner has indicated as being allowable. A more detailed explanation




1 of the amendments to claim 8 is provided above. Accordingly, claim 8 is  
2 now allowable.

3  
4 **SUMMARY**

5 The applicant believes this response constitutes a full and complete reply to  
6 the Office action mailed on 11/28/2005. The applicant further believes that claims 1,  
7 2, 4-8, and 10-21 are in allowable form, and that the application is now in condition  
8 for allowance.

9  
10 Date: February 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,  
Steve Jerman, Applicant

11 by   
12 Thomas Olson  
13 Attorney for Applicant  
14 Reg. No. 44,271  
15 (509) 327-4748  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25